DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 712 HE 034 835

AUTHOR	O'Meara, KerryAnn
TITLE	Scholarship Unbound: Assessing Service as Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Decisions. Working Paper.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts Univ., Boston. New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
REPORT NO	NERCHE-WP-25
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	35p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Higher Education; *Incentives; Personnel Policy; *Professional Services; *Scholarship; *School Culture

ABSTRACT

Scholars of higher education have long recognized that existing reward systems and structures in academic communities do not weight faculty professional service as they do teaching and research. This paper examines how four colleges and universities with exemplary programs for assessing services as scholarship implemented these policies within colleges of education. Attention was paid to the policies, procedures, outcomes, and elements of academic culture of these institutions. Case studies suggest that policies to assess service as scholarship can: (1) increase consistency among an institution's service mission, faculty workload, and reward system; (2) expand faculty views of scholarship; (3) boost faculty satisfaction; and (4) strengthen the quality of an institution's service culture. The experiences of these four institutions suggest lessons for academic leaders for assessing and rewarding service as scholarship for promotion and tenure. (Contains 111 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 463 712

Scholarship Unbound: Assessing Service as Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Decisions

Working Paper #25

KerryAnn O'Meara

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.J. Hirsch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

HE 034 835

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

NERCHE
NEW ENGLAND RESOURCE
CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Working Paper # 25

Scholarship Unbound: Assessing Service As Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure Decisions

Kerry Ann O'Meara

Winter 2001

University of Massachusetts Boston
Graduate College of Education
W/2/159
Boston, Massachusetts 02125-3393
Phone: (617) 287-7740
Fax: (617) 287-7747
Email: nerche@umb.edu
Website: www.nerche.org

Abstract

Scholars of higher education have long recognized that existing reward systems and structures in academic communities do not weight faculty professional service as they do teaching and research. This paper examines how four colleges and universities with exemplary programs for assessing service as scholarship implemented these policies within colleges of education. Case studies suggest that policies to assess service as scholarship can increase consistency among an institution's service mission, faculty workload, and reward system; expand faculty's views of scholarship; boost faculty satisfaction; and strengthen the quality of an institution's service culture.

Introduction

Understanding how colleges and universities develop policies to assess and reward service as scholarship is important because commentators inside and outside of higher education have criticized colleges and universities for neglecting the service aspects of their missions (Bok, 1990; Harkavy & Puckett, 1991; Levine, 1994) and have called upon faculty to respond in applied, socially useful ways (Hirsch, 1996). Although many educators in higher education have touted the need for and importance of service (Boyer, 1990; Elman & Smock, 1985; Gamson, 1995; 1999; Lynton, 1995; Rice, 1991), there are few concrete examples of colleges and universities that have actually integrated service as scholarship into their promotion and tenure systems.

The purpose of the research from which this paper was drawn was to understand how colleges and universities develop policies to assess and reward service as scholarship, the elements of academic culture that help or hinder that process, how promotion and tenure committees apply new or amended policies to promotion and tenure decisions, and what the outcomes are of this process for education faculty. This paper summarizes the major findings of the study. (For a full report, contact the author.)

Methodology

The development, implementation, and outcomes of policies to assess service as scholarship in promotion and tenure were studied by selecting four institutions (one from each major Carnegie classification: baccalaureate, masters, doctoral, and research). The four institutions, which are called by the pseudonyms Erin College, Mid-West State University (MWSU), Patrick State University (PSU), and St. Tim's, were identified by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) and American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) as having recently developed exemplary programs for assessing service as scholarship. Specifically this research examined the policies and procedures, outcomes, and elements of academic cultures and four colleges/units of education that have integrated service as scholarship into their promotion and tenure systems.

Four site visits were conducted in the spring and fall of 1998 and 12-16 interviews per campus were conducted with administrators and faculty leaders involved in the policy changes, promotion and tenure committees, and with junior and senior education faculty. A key informant from each of the four campuses assisted the researcher in identifying participants. Documents such as promotion and tenure materials, internal memorandums, newsletters, and committee notes were reviewed as well. Finally, four case studies were constructed from the analyzed data.

There are several limitations inherent in case study research and in one year's data. This research was limited to four institutions with strong service missions and other unique cultural characteristics, and the institutions were not randomly selected. Universities that have become innovators in this area are likely to be unique in other ways. For this and many other reasons this study cannot be generalized to other colleges attempting similar change.

Summary of Major Findings

This study investigated how four colleges and universities developed policies to assess service as scholarship for their promotion and tenure systems. Policies to assess service as scholarship can serve important functions in: (1) making an institution's service mission, faculty workload, and reward system more consistent; (2) decreasing the exclusivity of research in promotion and tenure decisions and expanding faculty members' views of scholarship; (3) increasing faculty satisfaction, chances for promotion and tenure, and the quality of documentation among service scholars and; (4) strengthening the quality of faculty service and a university's service culture.

Lessons for Leaders

The experiences of these four institutions suggest a set of lessons for academic leaders (presidents, provosts, deans, department chairs or faculty) considering developing policies to assess and reward service as scholarship for promotion and tenure as well as higher education leaders attempting other kinds of organizational change.

Managing Academic Culture

While institutions have unique features and cultures depending on their missions, histories, and goals, increasingly they are responding to pressures that emphasize their similarities (Birnbaum, 1988). For decades, many institutions have modeled their research standards for faculty after those of the most prestigious universities in order to increase their national standing (Jencks & Reisman, 1968). This was true at each of the four campuses where traditional research was weighted heavily in promotion and tenure decisions—despite the fact that each campus had a strong and distinct service mission. For example, PSU had an urban metropolitan service mission, MWSU had a land-grant service mission, and Erin College had a social justice service mission. While St. Tim's service mission was not as imbedded in their culture as it was in the others', there was a significant history of applied scholarship. Before the 1980s, most faculty understood St. Tim's as a place that valued teaching and service over traditional research.

In addition, on each of the four campuses during the late 1980s and early 1990s, the faculty experienced a metamorphosis in which allegiance to discipline and national reputation slowly began to take priority over more local issues such as teaching and service. To different degrees, faculty at each of the institutions developed into what Gouldner (1957) has called "cosmopolitans" rather than "locals." Faculty became more influenced by invisible colleges or networks of colleagues at other institutions, and believed that scholarly work was always tied into larger discipline-related national issues, rather than local issues.

Birnbaum (1983) has pointed out the dangers inherent in this kind of homogenization in higher education. Different kinds of institutions are needed to fulfill the different roles and responsibilities in American society. Without this we loose an important and valuable diversity within higher education.

This study suggests that institutions with strong teaching and service missions which develop faculty reward systems that favor research will likely experience a fragmentation of sorts, characterized by faculty dissatisfaction with the disconnection between and among institutional mission, faculty interests, faculty

workload, and rewards. Furthermore, if campus rhetoric extols the virtues of faculty service while rewarding research, the campus loses important opportunities to do what they do best. Most colleges and universities can only hope to be in the middle to bottom percentile of research output and prestige; however, these same colleges can be leaders in the areas of knowledge application and transmission. Given that many baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral universities attract faculty who are most skilled in engaging in teaching and service as scholarship, it makes sense to match institutional rewards with the areas in which the majority of their faculty excel and that are most consistent with the institutional mission.

National efforts to redefine scholarship have had a significant effect on slowing the trend toward solely rewarding research as scholarship for promotion and tenure. These efforts were effective because they came at a time when baccalaureate, masters, and some doctoral campuses were concerned about re-establishing their teaching and service missions and at a time when research institutions needed an alternative way to acknowledge those faculty whose work emphasized teaching and service. Boyer's (1990) Scholarship Reconsidered, which recommended that colleges and universities expand their definition of scholarship to include teaching, discovery, integration, and application of knowledge, provided a framework for colleges and universities to acknowledge the talents of those within their ranks who were responding to the public's call for socially useful faculty work.

Leaders at Every Level

Schein (1992) observed that the next generation of leaders will need: to understand the culture in which they are embedded, to surmount their own taken-for-granted assumptions, to orchestrate events and processes that enable groups to evolve toward new cultural assumptions, to articulate and endorse new visions and concepts, to recognize that for individuals to think differently they need to be actively involved in the process, and to have the willingness and ability to elicit the participation of others in change processes. Indeed, these are exactly the kinds of skills academic leaders who are developing policies to assess service as scholarship will need to understand the barriers they face in their own academic culture and the resources they need to make the policies succeed. It is crucial that

leaders have in mind who will be implementing the policy and who will be making sure the policy is followed at every step of policy development.

There are many concrete contributions different campus leaders can make throughout the process. Provosts can play a critical role in sparking conversations about rewarding service as scholarship on their campuses, provide a vision, launch the effort, choose and support the right people for leadership positions, help to guide committee work toward campus ratification, provide faculty development and promotion and tenure committee training and guidance, and communicate repeatedly the reasons that the campus is pursuing this effort and why it is important. In addition, presidents and provosts can provide structural and financial support to promote service as scholarship on campus. However, it is critical that provosts do not make changes on their own; rather, the process needs to be campus-wide. PSU's provost built alliances among faculty and showed foresight by sponsoring faculty leaders' attendance at national conferences where redefining scholarship was discussed. In fact, many academic leaders in this study spent a great deal of time providing faculty development sessions and workshops on the new policies and helping candidates as they prepared to "make their case" for promotion or tenure. These efforts increased faculty confidence in their work, elevated the quality of documentation of service as scholarship, and thereby supported implementation.

Mid-level administrators, such as deans and directors, have been described as the invisible leaders of higher education (Young, 1990), and are crucial to the development of policies. They can act as cheerleaders, work to fashion democratic processes, gain faculty consensus, draft documents, and keep committee processes on track.

At some campuses the cultural capital of leaders who had been there a long time aided the change process. Both the dean and director of faculty development at St. Tim's and the provost at Erin College were aided considerably by their "cultural capitol" and a respect from their colleagues that resulted from decades of hard work and service to their institution. Newcomers can also play a key role in guiding change. At PSU the arrival of a new president with a vision for PSU as an

urban metropolitan university "dramatically opened people up" according to one faculty member.

Kerr (1982) has noted the tendency for colleges and universities to resist change and retain the status quo, because it is the only option that cannot be vetoed. Each of these four campuses were attempting change in the midst of very powerful resistance, because, to some degree, an emphasis on research had permeated each of their faculty evaluation systems. Bergquist (1992) has claimed that "to understand the resistance experienced in any collegiate organization to a new idea or innovative program, one must first determine the way in which the idea or program will be interpreted by those now there—in light of their past history in the organization and the organization's dominant culture" (p. 228). Campus leaders interested in making changes to the reward system need to spend ample time "sizing up" how the dominant academic culture on their campus will respond. They need to understand the elements and resources that kept the former practice in place.

Leaders also need to consider the timing of the initiative and determine whether the institution is positioned to embark on a particular organizational change. For example, at St. Tim's the Dean had long recognized the need for change but waited until Boyer's report was published to launch their initiative because he felt the college needed a strong intellectual foundation on which to build their efforts.

Triggers for Change

Siehl (1985) identified several triggers that can induce culture change: environmental crises, environmental opportunities, and internal revolutions. Academic leaders can shape how environmental crises, such as budget deficits, or internal revolutions like faculty dissatisfaction with the reward structure, are interpreted by the campus and what kind of impact these crises have on future directions. Academic leaders in each of the four institutions utilized events, both unexpected and planned, to move their institutions forward in an organizational change process. For example, PSU experienced a significant budget crisis which triggered a revision of the core curriculum and an infusion of service-learning. More

service-learning led to more faculty outreach and faculty demands to align the new workload with rewards. MWSU received a 10.2 million dollar grant to become a model for how a research land grant university could infuse service throughout the fabric of their institution. Both the budget crisis and grant opportunity greatly influenced the decision to change the reward system.

Bolman and Deal (1991) have suggested that one way to view organizations is through a symbolic frame in which "cultures are propelled more by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes and myths, than by rules, policies and managerial authority"(pp. 15-16). Leaders also capitalized on unique cultural characteristics of each of these campuses to shape change. St. Tim's Dean and Director of Faculty Development drew upon the college's tendency toward collegial decision-making in crafting their change process. Erin's Provost argued that service be assessed as scholarship because of Erin's history of applied scholarship and commitment to social justice. In each of these cases academic leaders utilized characteristics of their existing cultures to move toward change. In addition, PSU had a history of adapting quickly to change, taking risks, and implementing innovative solutions. Changes made to the reward system were part of a landscape of change in curriculum, administrative services, and leadership for this institution. MWSU's status as the number two state university led MWSU's central administration and faculty to look for different ways (in addition to research) to distinguish themselves within their state. As a result, MWSU focused on the land grant mission as a distinct feature of the university. This inspired central administration's desire for MWSU to become a leader in the area of service scholarship assessment.

Deans, department chairs, and senior faculty are critical to successful policy implementation. Especially at large universities with fairly autonomous units, it is necessary to involve the colleges and departments that will be asked to interpret and implement the policies in the decision making. In this study, in cases of autonomous colleges of education, the deans, department chairs, and senior education faculty needed to be on-board from the very beginning of new policy development.

Deans exercise a great deal of indirect power over faculty through their control of resources (Wolverton, Wolverton, & Gmelch, 1999). In this study, deans were especially important in the larger universities in determining whether the faculty accepted or rejected the idea of service as scholarship. Typically, deans of colleges of education are influential in overseeing reward systems. Without the support of the dean, new policies to assess service as scholarship are unlikely to be implemented. For example, PSU's Dean was an advocate of expanding the definition of scholarship and acted as a steward of the policy in his college, counseling promotion and tenure applicants and working behind the scenes with the promotion and tenure committee to ensure the success of "alternative applications." He was also involved in the institution-wide deliberations. MWSU's Dean, however, reported that the institution-wide policy "landed on her desk" one day, and because it was not consistent with her own views of outreach and rewards, did very little to implement the policy in her college. Her lack of advocacy and support for the policy was one of the major reasons that it was not fully implemented as intended in the college of education.

Department chairs are reported by both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty to be the most important players in issues involving faculty's work roles and workload, chances for promotion, salary/compensation, role in governance, professional development, academic freedom, and professional status (Chronister & Baldwin, 1999). Because department chairs oversee workload assignments and recommendations for promotion and tenure, their approval is necessary for new policies to assess service as scholarship to be successful. Service scholars at St. Tim's, PSU and Erin College, especially in the area of teacher education, reported that their department chairs' support of their application for promotion and tenure was critical.

Senior faculty often hold key positions within departments, serving as chairs of promotion committees and selecting and mentoring junior faculty. Consequently, they can act either as roadblocks for or shepherds of cultural change within a college. In this study senior faculty resistance and opposition at times worked against policy implementation. For example, at PSU there were senior faculty who

counseled junior faculty not to "believe or trust in" the new policy and to continue to prepare only traditional research for their promotion and tenure bids. Had they made more concerted efforts to gain senior faculty support from the beginning, leaders may have avoided this problem.

Shaping the Process

The process used to bring about the changes, the means to the end, can have a significant impact on campus community, faculty satisfaction, and the development of faculty consensus on institutional mission and purposes. For example, PSU, St. Tim's, and MWSU's leaders facilitated highly democratic and inclusive processes. They developed many ways to solicit feedback, including inviting dissenting opinions, distributing multiple drafts to key decision-makers, and as one administrator put it, "listen[ing] people to death." They employed a double strategy of genuinely including a diversity of opinions in each stage of the process and quelling potential opposition by making everyone feel as if they were a part of the process. This led to an improved sense of community among all involved in the policy change. On the campuses where they were involved in the development of policies, faculty felt more responsibility and ownership for them and there was a greater chance that the policies would be disseminated and understood.

Clear Performance Expectations

This study suggests that when vague and informal performance expectations are used to make promotion and tenure decisions, both the institutions and their faculty lose. Faculty become preoccupied and unproductive as they struggle to understand what is expected of them. Consequently, academic leaders should strive to make informal and formal performance expectations consistent. Changes to promotion and tenure policies need to be formally and repeatedly announced to every faculty member in unambiguous language. Also, informal promotion and tenure committee preferences for certain kinds of documentation, such as the relative value of journal articles and grant funding, should be explained to candidates when they are first hired. The process by which committee members decide whether and how well the candidate has contributed to the college needs to be made explicit.

Assessment of Service as Scholarship

The best policies are specific and comprehensive. Gamson and Finnegan (1996) have pointed out that faculty are socialized "to be members of their disciplines in graduate school and become steeped in values, beliefs, and methods espoused by invisible colleges" (p. 172). Therefore, "when the institutional mission is not used to define the criteria and standards within faculty personnel policies, faculty are encouraged to apply the professional standards by which they were socialized, that is, the culture of research (p.172)." For this reason and because the area of assessing service as scholarship is, as Russ Edgerton (1995) has described, "messy," and a relatively new effort, the best policies will allow for flexibility but will leave little to interpretation. In all four cases promotion and tenure committee members and administrators involved with promotion and tenure complained about the "holes" left in the new policies to assess service as scholarship. The more specific the policy about assessing service as scholarship was, the more confidant the committee felt about their decisions and, most important, the more successful the candidate was in meeting scholarship expectations.

Effective policies to assess service as scholarship account for differences between indicators of quality for teaching, research, and service. The best policies separate service as scholarship from disciplinary related service, governance, and community service; provide examples of service as scholarship in different disciplines, and of external service that is not scholarship; list specific guidelines for documentation of service as scholarship; require a scholarly profile or narrative where faculty can make the case that their service is scholarship; provide both specific criteria for assessing service as scholarship; and identify appropriate evaluators of service as scholarship.

Gaining Consensus on Interpreting Policies

Those involved in creating service as scholarship policies need to work with promotion and tenure committees to gain consensus and clarity on the interpretation of the policies. At the very beginning of the academic year, policy-makers should work with promotion and tenure committees to consider the following

questions before they start reviewing candidates with service as scholarship portfolios: Will relationship-building, and the development of ethical reciprocal partnerships count toward the evaluation of scholarship? If so, how much? Will we assign individual merit to collaborative work and how? Will we consider paid and unpaid service equally? Will we allow for fewer publications in lieu of different kinds of writing products? Will we accept newer research methodologies like qualitative inquiry, phenomenology, or participatory action research, where the findings are presented in a more practitioner and perhaps less theoretical construction? By answering these and related questions first, promotion and tenure committees can eliminate some of the inconsistency that can characterize decisions made on a case-by-case basis.

New Roles for Faculty

Assessing service as scholarship may change the nature of faculty evaluation and faculty roles. Making Outreach Visible (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999) describes a process of documentation in which service scholars were, "struggling to fit their service scholarship to the protocols of traditional scholarship." One service scholar, Warren Rauhe, is quoted as saying, "My outreach activities are not meant to be a substitute for traditional research scholarship. They represent a new paradigm." As the participants in Driscoll and Lynton's (1999) Kellogg-funded project documented their service as scholarship, they found that some criteria traditionally used to evaluate research—such as the universal categories of goals, questions, and methods—were also applicable to the documentation and assessment of service as scholarship. They also found, however, that they needed to use other criteria that was specifically relevant to service as scholarship, and not used to evaluate teaching and research. Likewise, the documentation and the assessment of service as scholarship in these four cases raised some important questions about the typical indicators of quality scholarship.

Academic expertise as a criterion for scholarship assumes that the faculty member is an expert and that their unique knowledge in a subject area is the chief characteristic that makes them a scholar in any given situation. Yet in service settings faculty often work with practitioners and community members on

collaborative projects in an effort to create what Judith Ramaley (1998) has called, "reciprocal movements between the university's knowledge and community knowledge." The faculty member is acting as a facilitator of the many sets of knowledge that all project participants bring to the table. In fact, the faculty member may be "learning" as much as he or she is "teaching." Service as scholarship suggests a new role for faculty in which they are not as remote from those they serve as teachers are from students or researchers are from their subjects. While these faculty are skilled in content knowledge, they also possess skill knowledge in integrating, synthesizing, connecting and accepting knowledge in partnership with other "experts" in community settings.

The traditional criteria of peer review suggests that appropriate evaluators of the scholarly nature of the faculty member's work must only be those colleagues who have the same or greater content knowledge as the faculty member. For example, peer review of teaching and curriculum review by other faculty members are often given more weight than student evaluations in assessing teaching as scholarship. Service as scholarship questions the premise that those who receive services or are partners in delivering service are not appropriate judges of scholarly quality. Braskamp and Ory (1994) have stated that nonacademic colleagues, including recipients of outreach, can contribute important perspectives to the faculty evaluation process. The authors encourage campuses to include a variety evaluators.

Finally, the tradition of academic writing as the preferred method of dissemination of scholarship is under scrutiny. Faculty who engage in service as scholarship apply theory to solve problems. These faculty struggle with whether to assess a process, a product, or both. Because assessing service as scholarship is new to institutions, it is not clear whether service projects without writing products should constitute legitimate scholarship. Furthermore, institutions have not yet decided to whom service as scholarship should be disseminated. Traditionally scholarship is disseminated primarily to an academic audience. If one of the main purposes of knowledge application is to make a significant change in the way practitioners act and think, then dissemination to practitioner communities could be

an appropriate measure of scholarship. Rewarding only the product and not the process of scholarship in assessment is limited (Braskamp & Ory, 1994). If assessment of service as scholarship values only written products faculty will be encouraged to engage in short-term projects rather than those that are more complex because multiple short-term projects will yield more written products (Braskamp & Ory, 1994). Promotion and tenure committees should find ways to balance the weight they give to the process and the product of scholarship.

Supporting Faculty in Portfolio Development

Provosts, deans, department chairs, and associate deans involved in faculty development and assisting faculty in preparing portfolios for promotion and tenure review reported that their faculty needed help in presenting their service in such a way as it would be viewed as scholarship. Many of the candidates with service as scholarship portfolios in this study would not have been successful without the assistance of a more senior faculty member or administrator who guided them in documenting and presenting their work. Specifically, they need help in clarifying the scholarly questions that guided their study and identifying the literature and conceptual framework employed in descriptive terms. Candidates need help considering how to document their service as an on-going process, rather than as the outcomes of different activities. They need to be guided to consider the audience and purpose of the information in their portfolio, to document individual contributions and expertise instead of the entire project team's impact, and to locate the activity in the department and institutional mission. In addition, faculty should be encouraged to integrate their teaching, service, and research as much as possible. Universities might consider establishing formal or informal mentoring programs in departments or colleges to facilitate this process.

In each of the four cases in this study faculty received inadequate feedback in yearly reviews and after promotion and tenure decisions on how to improve their service as scholarship. The assessment of service as scholarship needs to include an element of faculty development so faculty understand those areas that require bolstering and those that have met the standards (Braskamp & Ory, 1994).

The acceptance and assessment of service as scholarship may begin to change faculty roles. As more and more campuses rethink how they evaluate and reward their faculty members' outreach, more and more faculty may begin to see their roles as a scholar and teacher differently.

Managing Outcomes

Finnegan and Gamson (1996) have demonstrated that a new cultural schema cannot be adopted wholesale without the resources to support it. In each of the four cases the new cultural schema introduced was a new definition of scholarship and a policy to reward service as scholarship for promotion and tenure. In each case, resources were required for the successful implementation of the new policies. Each of the campuses needed three important resources to ensure effective policy implementation: an effective dissemination strategy; the acceptance and backing of senior education faculty, department chairs, and the dean; and time. It is important for academic leaders to try to predict which resources will be required to successfully institutionalize their policies and build as many of them into their implementation plan as possible. In addition, academic leaders need to prepare to manage unexpected and/or unintended outcomes from policy changes.

Successful policy implementation requires academic leaders to minimize the mixed messages that result from new faculty reward systems. Randy Bass (1999) described the tenure process much like the panopticon in Foucault's Discipline and Punish. Faculty behavior is controlled by the threat of an unclear evaluation. While the faculty in this study did not experience their tenure systems quite as starkly, there is something to be said for the intense stress and anxiety that faculty endure when policies are left vague, and rhetoric and actual rewards are inconsistent.

In each of the four cases, faculty experienced significant dissatisfaction before policy changes and mixed messages after policy changes. Recognizing service as scholarship may be one way to reduce the anxiety felt by faculty about their chances for promotion and tenure, but it does not necessarily wipe out informal expectations and mixed messages about promotion and tenure communicated by colleagues.

In this study, the development and implementation of policies to assess service as scholarship had a powerful psychological effect in reducing the stress and resentment faculty felt at being under-valued, over-worked, and under-paid. The policies made service scholars feel safer, more appreciated and understood, and thereby made them feel more committed and loyal to their institutions. The policies functioned as a procedural contract wherein faculty engaged in service as scholarship assumed that if they met all of the criteria for assessing service as scholarship, they would be promoted. If for no other reason, policies to assess service as scholarship should be created in order to satisfy, value, reward, and retain those faculty who fulfill their institution's service mission.

Positive Effects for Women Faculty

Policies to assess service as scholarship may help women faculty. Most of the service scholars interviewed in this study were women. On average, women publish less than men and earn lower salaries but report spending more time on teaching and service (Long & Fox, 1995). Most reward systems value research productivity above all other types of faculty work. Therefore, the outcomes of policies that revise the reward system to increase rewards for teaching and service are critical to the status of women in the academy. Creamer (1998) has stated:

> The profile of faculty across this country has remained so stubbornly homogeneous because of the reluctance to relinquish traditional measures of faculty productivity. A narrow definition of what constitutes a contribution to knowledge represents only a fragment of academic discourse, and it awards the privilege of an authoritative voice to only a few scholars. Expanding the definition of scholarship will benefit minority, female, and male academics alike.

C. Wright Mills (1959) said that, "scholarship is a choice of how to live, as well as a choice of a career." Service scholars are faculty with rare gifts for discovering and applying knowledge in community settings. They have chosen a particular kind of scholarship, which they find consistent with their values, to frame their career. Singleton, Hirsch, and Burack (1997) found that service scholars across several campuses consciously attended to links between service and high quality scholarship, garnered and creatively deployed institutional support and resources, had the flexibility to respond to changing situations and opportunities,

and conducted effective missionary work to other campus members to increase service visibility. Service scholars in these four cases employed the same set of skills and were important leaders in policy development and implementation. Service scholars need to be nurtured, supported, made visible, employed as mentors, and encouraged to serve on promotion and tenure committees. Whenever possible, service scholars should be consulted for their evaluation of other faculty members' service as scholarship—either as promotion and tenure members or as internal reviewers.

Recommendations

The rise of research culture within colleges and universities is very instructive for those who are interested in constructing or strengthening service culture within colleges and universities. Adequate resources were critical to research culture's ascent. Key resources within academe include graduate school training, faculty hiring processes, travel funds, faculty and staff personnel lines, promotion and tenure systems, salaries, awards, and perhaps most of all "reputation and standing in the academic hierarchy" (Gamson & Finnegan, 1996). These resources exist at the national level through disciplinary associations and at the local level in departments.

For those faculty and policy-makers interested in strengthening the service culture of higher education, it is worthwhile to obtain the same kind of resources that advanced the research culture. Advocates of service culture could influence graduate student training and socialization so that graduate students developed skills and interests in service as scholarship. These advocates could create multiple opportunities across disciplines for young scholars to learn how to apply knowledge in community settings. Service advocates could work with disciplinary associations or create alternative associations that over time would develop discipline-specific approaches to apply knowledge. These associations could develop methods to assess service as scholarship and could create journals, web sites, and multi-media outlets where faculty involved in service as scholarship could disseminate their work across their discipline nationally. Endowed chairs and post-doctoral fellowships

emphasizing service as scholarship could be created. Furthermore, advocates could find ways through Carnegie classifications and U.S. News and World Report to rank universities by their contributions to solving the problems of their communities and to applying knowledge in innovative ways. This would create market pressures for deans and department chairs to reward service as scholarship. Merit pay, salaries, and promotion and tenure rewards would follow.

However, there were service scholars in this study who said that advocating for service as scholarship in colleges and universities is about more than just how faculty get rewarded. They see it as a revolutionary attempt to change the values of higher education. Rather than creating similar national structures to assess and reward service as scholarship, which might strengthen the role of faculty member as expert, increase the differences between disciplines, and maintain the cosmopolitan nature of rewards, these advocates believe that regional and local contributions should be given primacy. They argue for graduate training and reward systems to value more collaborative scholarship as well as the skills of faculty who work on the borders of theory and practice. They argue that higher education should reconsider the weight given to the discovery of knowledge versus the teaching, integration, and application of knowledge. In other words, they would not use the same resources to build a service culture, because they do not agree with the values and assumptions embedded in those resources, and would rather transform higher education's values while building service culture. The fact is that these two camps exist: one that wants to enhance service culture by working within existing structures and one that wants to change the very paradigm those structures are built upon. Both strategies or views have the potential to nurture change efforts. Also, both views require a transformation of higher education, an expansion of its view of itself and its role in society, and internal restructuring to better align faculty to collectively meet the needs of students and society. While it may not be likely or desirable for higher education to reorganize in either of these ways, advocates of service as scholarship can still use these strategies to cultivate colleges and universities with stronger service cultures. Some institutions will choose to emphasize research or teaching to the exclusion of their other missions. However, for those institutions that

take up the call to transform higher education to become more involved in service, this is a good time to press for change. There are major generational changes within the faculty that present opportunities for refocusing faculty and graduate student training (Rice, 1999). Academic collaborations with government, private businesses, and community agencies are breaking down knowledge boundaries between research universities and communities (Walshok, 1999). Finally, the growth of service-learning and participatory action research and accountability pressures from state governments and the public make this a particularly good time for advocates of service culture to begin transformations that can take hold.

The Role of Research Universities

This study demonstrated that institutions with strong teaching and service missions, service cultures, faculty strengths in service as scholarship, and a history of innovation, are most inclined to integrate service as scholarship into faculty evaluation and most likely to benefit from its inclusion. Consequently, public masters and doctoral institutions, often referred to as "comprehensive colleges and universities" are probably more likely than top-tier private research universities to adopt and benefit from policies to assess service as scholarship. Research universities are the gatekeepers of higher education and have a disproportionate influence on the future direction of all colleges and universities (Checkoway, 1999). If higher education is going to narrow the gap between knowledge creation and knowledge application, then research universities must be involved and help to lead the way. Since research universities train the greatest number of future faculty, they could make a major contribution to preparing future scholars with skills in knowledge application and integration, and for roles that extend into their communities of practice. Because other universities look to research universities for leadership, they can begin to reward those faculty who are fulfilling the service aspects of their mission. Finally, Hollander (1999) has commented that one of the best things about research universities is that they are thinking places with deep discipline-specific knowledge about issues and rich research methodologies with which to study phenomena. Research universities can contribute to their own service mission and the service mission of higher education by studying the most

effective processes for the transmission of new knowledge to local community problems and issues as well as the reward systems and structures within universities that make this work possible.

Rewarding Service Scholarship at All Institutions

In "Reversing the Telescope" Lynton (1998) argued that institutions need to stop viewing faculty work in isolation and begin seeing the ways that faculty work contributes to common department, college, and institutional needs. There are reasons for all types of colleges and universities, including research universities, to consider rewarding service as scholarship and integrating Boyer's expanded view of scholarship into faculty evaluation. First, there has been a public call to all of higher education, not just certain kinds of universities, for greater knowledge application and service. Second, just about every U.S. four-year college espouses a service mission and attracts some faculty with skills in applying knowledge in community settings. If institutions intend to have even a few of their faculty fulfill their service mission, they must reward those faculty members for their work. Consequently, institutions need appropriate measures to assess the quality of service as scholarship. Third, institutions that assess and reward service as scholarship are able to acknowledge different faculty strengths; make rhetoric, workload, and reward system consistent; and create or sustain a service culture. This in turn can increase faculty satisfaction, which may increase institutional effectiveness. Fourth, for some disciplines, faculty reward systems that acknowledge multiple forms of scholarship lessen the disadvantage professional schools and certain disciplines experience because of their faculties' tendency to prioritize teaching and service over research. Finally, polices that reward service as scholarship may enhance the quality of faculty service by creating more incentives for faculty to improve in this area. These policies may also create a more equitable playing field in promotion and tenure for women faculty who report spending more time on teaching and service.

Conclusion

Market forces in higher education push institutions toward the adoption of research culture and toward prioritizing research above teaching and service in faculty evaluation systems. In this study all four institutions experienced this kind of pressure as they tried, to different degrees, to increase their national standing within the academic labor market and compete with their peers for graduate students, external funding, national rankings, and faculty productivity. However, each of the institutions found that in responding to these pressures they created a disconnect between their mission, faculty talents, and workload and rewards. Consequently, these four institutions did something unusual. Consistent with their mission and the national movement to redefine scholarship, they decided to resist some of these pressures and value service as scholarship for promotion and tenure. This response, however, is not the norm. The question is raised: Why would/should colleges and universities institute faculty reward systems that challenge powerful market-driven forces? Why would colleges and universities make a decision that seems to endanger their competitiveness in the academic market, academic socialization, disciplinary association interests, and the likelihood for major research funding?

One answer implied by this study is that these leaders took a good hard look at their colleges and universities and saw that their service mission, and their college's capacity to apply knowledge to community problems were two of their institution's greatest strengths. At that point, academic leaders and faculty led their campuses toward rewarding service as scholarship because they thought it would move their institutions closer toward fulfilling their mission. They believed that if they were true to their service missions, and rewarded their faculty for who they were, and what they did best, that other benefits would follow. Institutions like PSU, St. Tim's, MWSU, and Erin that are true to their missions will likely find increased effectiveness through enhanced faculty satisfaction, increased attention and prestige as innovators, and increased competitiveness gained by focusing on strengths in teaching and service. These academic leaders recognized that their institutions would never have the research resources of Harvard, but that Harvard would never have their unique mission and faculty talent in transmission and

application of knowledge. They decided to take a risk by valuing what their institution already was, and building toward what it could become. Colleges and universities which follow their lead and recognize, reward, and seek to improve upon what they do best, will likely improve their own institutional effectiveness and make a major contribution to the needs of society and diversification of American higher education.

Bibliography

Adamay, D. (1994). Sustaining university values while reinventing university commitments to our cities. Teachers College Record, 95(3), 324-331.

Ansley, F. & Gaventa, J. (1997, Jan/Feb). Researching for democracy and democratizing research. Change, 29(1).

Baldridge, J.V. (1971). Power and conflict in the university: Research in the sociology of complex organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Becher, T. (1989). Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual inquiry and the culture of disciplines. The society for research into higher education. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Bergquist, W.H. (1992). Four cultures of the academy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bernstein, A.B. (1994). Knowledge utilization universities. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.

Birnbaum, R. (1983). Maintaining diversity in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blackburn, R.T. & Wylie, N. (1985, March). Current appointment and tenure practices: Their impact on new faculty carreers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Study for Higher Education, Chicago, IL.

Bledstein, B.J. (1978). The culture of professionalism. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Boice, R. (1992). Lessons learned about mentoring. In Developing New and Junior Faculty (M.D. Sorcinelli & A.E. Austin, eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, D. (1991). Universities and the search for a better society. In J.L. Bess (Ed.), Foundations of American Higher Education (pp. 688-698). Needham Heights, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Bok, D. (1982) Beyond the ivory tower. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. (1994, March 9). Creating the new American college. Chronicle of Higher Education, 40, A18.

Braskamp, L.A. & Ory, J.C. (1994). Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and institutional performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, R.S. & Kurland, J.E. (1990). Academic tenure and academic freedom. Law and Contemporary Problems 53, 325-355.

Campoy, R.W. (1996, March). Teacher education goes to school. The American School Board Journal, pp. 32-34.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1996, September 13). Survey: Faculty attitudes and characteristics: Results of a 1995-1996 survey. Chronicle of Higher Education, 43, A12

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, (1976). A classification of institutions of higher education (Rev.ed). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Chait, R. (1995). The future of academic tenure. Priorities, 3, 1-11.

Checkoway, B. (1999, July). Opening plenary session. Presented at the Strategies for Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University, Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI.

Chronister, J.L. & Baldwin, J.V. (1999, June). Non tenure track faculty. Comments made at Harvard University, Graduate School of Education.

Chronister, J.L. Baldwin, R.G. & Bailey, T.G. (1991, November). Full-time non-tenure track faculty: Current status, future prospects, remaining research questions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Boston, MA.

Clark, B.R. (1987). The academic life. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Creamer, E. (1998). Assessing faculty publication productivity: Issues of equity (J. Fife, Ed). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Crosson, P.H. (1983). Public service in higher education (J. Fife, Ed.). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Dey, E.L., Milem, J.F., & Berger, J.B. (1997, March) Changing patterns of publication productivity: accumulative advantage or institutional ismorphism? Paper

presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Diamond, R.M. & Adam, B.E. (Eds.). (1995). The disciplines speak. American Association for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.

DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review 48,147-160.

Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E.A. (1999). Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., & Quinlan, K. (1991). The teaching portfolio: capturing the scholarship in teaching. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Edgerton, R. (1995). Foreword. In E.A. Lynton. Making the case for professional service. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Elman, S.E. & Smock, E.M. (1985) Professional service and faculty rewards: toward an integrated structure. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Fairweather, J.S. (1994). Faculty rewards: The comprehensive college and university story. Metropolitan Universities, 5(1), 54-61.

Fairweather, J.S. (1993). Faculty reward structures; toward institutional and professional homogenization. Research in Higher Education, 34(5), 603-623.

Fairweather, J.S. (1993, July-August) Faculty rewards reconsidered: The nature of trade-offs. Change, 25(4), 44-47.

Finkelstein, B. & Efthimiou, H. (1999) In search of status: Teacher education in the United States. In P. Morris & J. Williamson (Eds.), Teacher education in the Asia-Pacific region : A comparative study. New York : Garland.

Fisher, C. & Gitelson, R. (1983). A meta-analysis of the correlates of role conflict and ambiguity. Journal of Applied Pyschology, 68, 320-333.

Fox, M.F. (1985). Publication, performance, and reward in science and scholarship. In J.C. Smart (Ed.) Higher education: Handbook of theory and research. Vol. 1. Ediston, NJ: Agathon Press.

Gamson, Z.F. (1995, January/February). Faculty and service. Change.

Gamson, Z.F. & Finnegan, D.E. (1996). Disciplinary adaptions to research culture in comprehensive institutions. The Review of Higher Education, (19)2, 141-177.

Glassick,C.E, Huber, M.T., & Maeroff, G.I. (1997) Scholarship Assessed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gmelch, W.H., Lovrich, N.P. & Wilkie, P.K. (1984). Sources of stress in academe: A national perspective. Research in Higher Education, 20, 477-490.

Gmelch, W.H., Lovrich, N.P. & Wilkie, P.K. (1986). Dimensions of stress among university faculty: Factor analysis results form a national study. Research in Higher Education 24, 266-286.

Gouldner, A.W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 281-307.

Harkavy, I. & Puckett, J.L (1991). Toward effective university-public school partnerships: An analysis of a contemporary model. Teachers College Record, 2, 556-583.

Harkavy, I. & Puckett, J.L. (1994) Lessons from hull house for the contemporary urban university. Social Service Review, 68, 299-321.

Hirsch, D. (1996, May). An agenda for involving faculty in service. AAHE Bulletin. 48(9), 7-9.

Hollander, E. (1999, July). Plenary session, action steps for advancing the cause. Presented at the Strategies for Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University, Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI.

Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). The Academic Revolution. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kerr, C. (1963). The uses of the univeristy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, C. (1982). Postscript 1982. Change, 23-31.

Kirshstein, R. J. (1997, March) What faculty do? A look at academic work. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Kuhn, T.S. (1970) The Structure of scientific revolutions (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lawson, H.A. (1990) Constraints on the professional service of education faculty. Journal of Teacher Education 41(4), 57-70.

Levine, A. (1994) Service on campus. Change.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1986). Naturalist inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage publications.

Long, J. and Fox, M. (1995). Scientific careers: Universalism and particularism. Annual Review of Sociology, 21, 45-71.

Lynton, E. A. (1995). Making the case for professional service. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Lynton, E. A. (1991). The Mission of metropolitan universities in the utilization of knowledge: A policy analysis. Boston: New England Research Center for Higher Education.

Lynton, E.A. (1983). A Crisis of purpose: Reexamining the role of the university. Change 15, 18-23, 53.

Lynton, E.A. (1994). Knowledge and scholarship. Metropolitan Universities 5,(1) 9-17.

Lynton, E.A. & Elman, S.A. (1987). New priorities for the university. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lynton, E.A. (1998, March). Reversing the telescope. AAHE Bulletin, 50, 8-10.

Malone, R. (1999). Tenure Track Faculty Socialization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maryland Higher Education Commission (1994). Documents collected for internal study of faculty workload issue.

Mills, C. W. (1959). The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

National Center for Higher Education Statistics, (1990). Institutional Policies Regarding Faculty in Higher Education. Washington, DC: Author.

New England Resource Center for Higher Education (1996). Documents from "Program on Faculty Professional Service and Academic Outreach."

O'Meara, K.A. (1997). Rewarding faculty professional service. Boston: New England Research Center for Higher Education.

O'Meara, K.A. (1995). Community service professionals: An emerging profession. Masters thesis, The Ohio State University.

Patton, M.Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Ramaley, J. (1999, July). Concluding plenary session: What are the priorities? What are the next steps? What have we learned. Presented at the Strategies for Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University, Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI.

Rice, R.E. (1991). The new American scholar: Scholarship and the purposes of the university. Metropolitan Universities, 1, 7-18.

Rice, R.E. (1993). Scholarly work and professional practice. New directions for teaching and learning, 54, 71-78.

Rice, R.E. (1996). Making a place for the new American scholar. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Rice, R.E. (1999). (1999, July). Roundtable discussion: Strategies and structures for institutional change. Presented at the Strategies for Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University, Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI.

Riley, G & Baldridge, J. V. (1978). Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university: A history. Athens, GA. The University of Georgia Press.

Ryan, D. (1980). Deans as individuals in organizations. In D. Griffith and D. McCarty (Eds.) The dilemma of the deanship. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Schein, E.H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership: A Dynamic view. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational Culture and Leadership. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D.A. (1983). The Reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

Schramm, W. (1971). Notes on case studies of instructional media projects. Working paper. Washington, D.C.: The Academy for Educational Development.

Scott, W.R. (1995). Institutions and organizations. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Selfin, P. (1991). The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions. Boston: Anker.

Senge, P.S. (1990). The fifth discipline. New York: Currency Doubleday.

Serow, R.C., Brawner, C.E., & Demery, J. (1999). Instructional reform at research universities: Studying faculty motivation. Review of Higher Education, 22(4), 411-423.

Sewell, W.H. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency and transformation. American Journal of Sociology, 98,(1), 1-29.

Shulman, L.S. (1993). Teaching as community property. Change 25, 6-7.

Siehl, C. (1985). After the founder: An opportunity to manage culture. In P. Frost, L., Moore, M. Louis, C. Lundberg & J. Martin (Eds.) Organizational Culture. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication. 125-140.

Singleton, S. Burack, C.A., & Hirsch, D. (1997). Faculty Service Enclaves. AAHE Bulletin, Vol. 49, No 8.

Singleton, S., Hirsch, D.,& Burack, C.A. (1997) Organizational structures for community engagement. Boston, MA: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.

Solmon, L.C. & Astin, A.W. (1981). Departments without distinguished graduate programs: Reputational ratings in history, economics, English, chemistry, sociology, and biology. Change 13(9), 23-28.

Sorcinelli, M.D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M.D. Sorcinelli and A.E. Austin (Eds.). Developing new and junior faculty: New directions for teaching and learning, (Vol. 50. pp. 27-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierney, W.G. & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe. New York: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W.G. (1999, January). Faculty of Education in a Period of Systematic Reform. Paper presented at Faculty Roles and Rewards Annual Conference. San Diego, CA.

Trower, C.A. (1996) Tenure snapshot. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Tuckman, H.P. (1976). Publication, teaching, and the academic reward structure. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). National Center for Education Statistics, National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, "Faculty survey" and 1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty, "Faculty Survey."

Viechnicki, K.J., Yanity, D. & Olinski, R. (1997, March). Action research in a school/university partnership. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Veysey, L.R. (1965). The emergence of the American university. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Walshok, M. (1999, July). Concluding plenary session: What are the priorities? What are the next steps? What have we learned? Presented at the Strategies for Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University, Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI.

Washington, R.O. (1993, November). Implementing the urban mission of an urban American university. Presented at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Alliance of Universities for Democracy, Budapest, Hungary.

Whitt, E.J. (1991). Hit the ground running: Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. The Review of Higher Education 14, 177-97.

Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M.L., & Gmelch, W.H. (1999). The impact of role ambiguity on academic deans. Journal of Higher Education, 70(1), 80-106.

Wright, C.A., & Wright, S.D. (1987). Young professionals. Family Relations 36 (2), 204-208.

Yin, R.K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Vol. 5. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Young R. B. (1990). The Invisible Leaders. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

About the Author

KerryAnn O'Meara is the Coordinator of the Project on Faculty Appointments, a grant-funded project to study organizational change and innovation in faculty employment at the Graduate School of Education at Harvard University. KerryAnn completed her Ph.D at the University of Maryland and her masters at The Ohio State University. KerryAnn's research experience and interests include organizational change, the service mission of higher education, the impact of market forces on higher education, and educational innovation. She has acted as a research associate for NERCHE on several occasions.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").